



**MINUTES  
FREMONT PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 23, 2004**

CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chairperson Wieckowski called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Weaver (arrived 7:03 p.m.), Vice Chairperson Wieckowski, Commissioners Harrison, King, Lydon, Natarajan, Sharma

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Schwob, Planning Director  
Larissa Seto, Senior Deputy City Attorney II  
Kathleen Livermore, Senior Planner  
Barbara Meerjans, Associate Planner  
Afshin Abtahi, Project Manager  
Ronnie Fong, Senior Civil Engineer  
Jake Lavin, Project Manager  
Alice Malotte, Recording Clerk  
Chavez Company, Remote Stenocaptioning  
Walter Garcia, Video Technician

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Regular Minutes of August 26, 2004, with the following correction:  
Linda Vista: "Glenmore" misspelled. Correct spelling is "Glenmoor".

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

THE CONSENT LIST CONSISTED OF ITEM NUMBERS 1, 2 AND 4.

IT WAS MOVED (HARRISON/KING) AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED BY ALL PRESENT THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTION ON ITEM NUMBERS 1, 2 AND 4.

**Item 1. KAISER BIO-MEDICAL DOCK PAD – 39400 Paseo Padre Parkway (PLN2004-00198)** - to consider a Finding for Site Plan and Architectural Approval through a Planned District Minor Amendment for a 476-square foot modular reception building, a covered walkway and a mobile trailer for diagnostic bio-medical procedures at an existing medical facility (Kaiser Permanente) located in the Central Planning Area. This project is categorically exempt from review under CEQA pursuant to Section 15301 (e) (Existing Facilities). (Continued from August 26, 2004)

**CONTINUE TO A DATE UNCERTAIN.**

**Item 2. DOUBLE WOOD GOLF COURSE – (PLN2005-00056)** - to consider a report from the Community Development Director on the status of a Development Agreement for a proposed golf course to be located between the terminus of Green Valley Road, Avalon Heights Terrace and Rancho Higuera Road. EIR 90-31 and Subsequent EIR 90-31A cover the golf course project. This annual report is not a project as defined in the CEQA Guidelines,

Section 15368, no further action is required and none of the conditions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requiring additional environmental documents exist.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked if the Community Development Director and the Assistant City Manager were the same; when the grading process would begin; and what was a “conferencing process.”

**Planning Director Schwob** stated that the Community Development Director and the Assistant City Manager were the same person; it was unknown when the grading would begin; and the “conferencing process,” in this case, was a discussion with the Fish and Wildlife Service to discuss the project.

**HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;**

**AND**

**FIND THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS NOT A PROJECT AS DEFINED IN CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15168 AND THAT NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT IS NEEDED FOR THIS REVIEW;**

**AND**

**FIND ON THE BASIS OF EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD AND PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING, THAT FOR THE REVIEW PERIOD OF 2003-2004, THE DEVELOPER HAS COMPLIED WITH ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT PLN2002-00273 BETWEEN THE CITY OF FREMONT AND DOUBLE WOOD GOLF COURSE, LLC.**

- Item 4. FIRE STATION NO. 6 – 4355 Central Avenue – (PLN2005-00051)** - to consider a finding of General Plan conformity for a proposed fire station site located in the Centerville Planning Area. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has prepared for this site.

**CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 14, 2004.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	7 – Harrison, King, Lydon, Natarajan, Sharma, Weaver, Wieckowski
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	0
RECUSE:	0

## **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**Nancy Jewell Cross**, Fremont-Newark resident and CEO of Clean Air Transport Systems, spoke of how to make central Fremont more “pedestrian, bicycle, stay-here friendly,” which included the “mile-around concept” and encouraged a “car-free, access friendly” area within a mile radius of public development. She pointed out the difficulty of getting to the city library without using an automobile as an example. She noted that signals in pedestrian-friendly downtown Oakland were scheduled to allow vehicles to travel at a rate of 12 to 15 miles per hour where in Fremont, the signals allowed vehicles to travel at 40 miles per hour, which was not pedestrian friendly.

**Chairperson Weaver** congratulated Commissioner Harrison on the birth of his second son.

## PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- Item 3. FIRE STATION NO. 8 – 35659 Fremont Boulevard – (PLN2004-00049)** - to consider a Planned District Major Amendment for a proposed fire station for a 0.913-acre parcel located in the Centerville Planning Area. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been previously prepared and adopted for this site.

**Note:** A new site plan has also been provided. The difference from the previous site plan is that the graphic symbols for trees have been removed and site and building information is provided.

### **MODIFICATION TO STAFF REPORT**

**Landscaping:** The site will have a variety of plant materials including the required street trees and site trees. ~~The enclosed landscape plan is very preliminary.~~ A revised landscape plan ~~will be~~ has been provided at the Planning Commission meeting. The revised plan responds to staff comments. However, the trash enclosure and the exact placement of trees along that row of parking will be adjusted during Development Organization review, per Condition D-4.

**City Landscape Architect Review of Proposed Tree Removal and Preservation:** The site contains one (1) mature tree, a Deodar Cedar with a D.B.H. of 30". This tree is designated for removal as a result of unavoidable conflicts with the proposed development. The tree is also in poor condition and may have difficulty surviving development impacts. The mitigation for the removal of this tree shall be a 36" box large canopy tree. This is consistent with the provisions of the Tree Preservation Ordinance. Mitigation is also required for the illegal removal of eighteen (18) trees by the previous property owner. This mitigation shall be twelve (12) 36" box large canopy trees.

### **Revised Landscape Conditions:**

- ~~D-1 — All planting areas containing trees shall be free of all utility structures (including light standards). Clearances between utilities and trees shall conform to SD-34 City Standard Street Tree Clearances.~~
- ~~D-2 — A landscape plan shall be submitted to the Development Organization, as directed by the City Landscape Architect, for review and approval, indicating full details regarding (1) paving materials and textures of walkways and paved pedestrian areas, (2) lighting of walkways and pedestrian areas with low intensity non-glare type fixtures, (3) screening of driveways and parking areas, and (4) landscaping of site and open areas. As part of the landscape plans the applicant shall submit:~~
- ~~a) — An underground irrigation plan.~~
  - ~~b) — Weed control specifications.~~
  - ~~c) — A lighting plan for the illumination of the building, pedestrian and parking areas. Type of lighting fixtures, their heights, intensity and direction shall be clearly indicated.~~
  - ~~d) — Construction details of raised planters, walkways, paths, benches, walls, fences, trellised, and other architectural features as appropriate to the project.~~

- ~~D-5 All provisions of the City of Fremont Landscape Development Requirements and Policies (LDRP) shall apply to this project unless otherwise approved by the City Landscape Architect.~~
- D-1 The project shall include the planting of thirteen (13) 36" box large canopy trees throughout the site species to be approved by staff during Development Organization review. These trees may include those designated as street trees.
- D-2 All planting areas containing trees shall be free of all Utility Structures (including light standards). Clearances between Utilities and Trees shall conform to SD-34 City Standard Street Tree Clearances.
- D-3 A landscape plan shall be submitted to the Development Organization or the with Final Map Improvement Plans, or both, as directed by the City Landscape Architect, for review and approval, indicating full details regarding (1) paving materials and textures of walkways and paved pedestrian areas, (2) lighting of walkways and pedestrian areas with low intensity non-glare type fixtures, (3) screening of driveways and parking areas, and (4) landscaping of open areas. As part of the landscape plans the applicant shall submit:
- a) An underground irrigation plan.
  - b) Weed control specifications.
  - c) A lighting plan for the illumination of the building, pedestrian and parking areas. Type of lighting fixtures, their heights, intensity and direction shall be clearly indicated.
  - d) Construction details of raised planters, walkways, paths, benches, walls, fences, trellises, and other architectural features as appropriate to the project.
- D-4 Per FMC 8-22009, parking areas not adjacent to perimeter require one (1) tree per every ten (10) parking spaces: However, these trees must be evenly distributed within the parking area. Relocate *Acer rubrum* at trash enclosure shown on Sheet L-1 of the exhibit to shade the parking lot. Widen landscape finger on western side of trash enclosure or create a planter (minimum internal width of 6') elsewhere, adjacent staff parking in this area to accommodate tree subject to staff approval during Development Organization.
- D-5 The applicant shall provide landscaping within bio-swales, grassy swales and detention ponds in compliance with NPDES standards subject to staff review during the development organization review period. Trees shall not be planted in the flow line of the swale.
- D-6 Applicant shall provide five (5) 36" box *Acer rubrum* Street Trees planted in the planting strip along Fremont Blvd. Street trees shall conform to City Standard Tree Planting Detail, SD-34. Utility locations shall be adjusted to allow for the planting of all five (5) trees in conformance with SD-34 Street Tree Clearances.
- D-7 All provisions of the City of Fremont Landscape Development Requirements and Policies (LDRP) shall apply to this project unless otherwise approved by the City Landscape Architect. Current copy of the LDRP available at the Engineering Counter shall prevail.

**Associate Planner Meerjans** stated that this project was funded by the Fire Safety Bond. This three-bay station would replace the station on Darwin Avenue.

**Project Manager Lavin** stated that this was the first of three new fire stations to be built, along with retrofitting the other seven fire stations in the city. Three community workshops had been held to solicit comments and suggestions for the fire station and all “sticking points” had been accommodated. The total cost of the project would be approximately 4.4 million dollars.

**Engineer Fong** stated that this was the first new fire station in the city for about twelve years. This building was planned to be a 50-year building and would be very efficient for the firefighters, easy to maintain, cost effective, energy efficient and with sustainable designs.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked if the fence was extended to eight feet, was it possible to cover the top two feet with vegetation.

**Project Manager Lavin** stated that his suggestion was a possibility. An eight-foot wall on the north side of the property might not be feasible, as the townhomes there had no more than a ten-foot back yard and it would cast shadows on the yard and create a sense of confinement. However, at the south of the property, an eight-foot wall would be appropriate, as a greenbelt would be between the wall and existing townhomes and those residents had indicated that they preferred the taller wall.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked how this building would be more energy efficient than a normal building. She asked if the conditions of approval could require that the building match or exceed the point requirement to be LEED certified.

**Engineer Fong** replied that Leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) was in the forefront of a nationwide effort for green, sustainable design. This building was planned to have everything in it that would be required for it to be a LEED certified building. However, LEED certification would not be applied for because of the five percent cost surcharge, which staff believed was not reasonable at this time. According to the LEED scorecard, 26 points were needed for a building to be LEED certified. At this time, the building was designed to have 31 points. City Council had not been firm about the green, sustainable design issue, up to this time, and it was something the City Council would have to decide for all city buildings.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked what the landscaping changes would be. She asked what style of architecture was the building and what direction the architect had been given.

**Associate Planner Meerjans** answered that the architecture reflected the function of the spaces, as directed by the Fire Department. The entrance needed to face the street and be identifiable from the street. The architecture was meant to reflect the surrounding residential properties with arches, pitched roof and similar roofing material. Natural lighting would be provided by many clerestory windows and solar tubes. The locations for utilities and street trees had not been decided at this time. The plant pallet would be the same as shown.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked if there was a reason why all of the windows were to consist of the darker than usual gray tinted glass. Could a clearer glass be used if the windows were recessed?

**Associate Planner Meerjans** replied that the glass was solar E efficient glass.

**Engineer Fong** stated that the glass was a LEED requirement. Title 24 had to be exceeded by at least ten percent, so a higher U Factor was needed for the glass. The afternoon, western exposure required that a high U Factor be used on the western wall.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked if a different tint could be used on the east side, which faced Fremont Boulevard.

**Engineer Fong** agreed that a different tint could be used on that side of the building.

**Vice-Chairperson Wieckowski** stated that his questions concerned the efficiency of the building and had been answered. He offered to recommend to City Council that this building be a green, sustainable building as long as it did not add to the cost.

**Commissioner Lydon** asked if there were any future benefits to the city if the building was LEED certified. He asked if the cost to LEED certify the building was five percent of the overall cost, what would the cost be for this building. Why would certification be significant, if the building met all of the LEED certification requirements and where did the certification cost go?

**Engineer Fong** replied that this would be the first LEED certified building in the city and the first public building in this area of the county. The cost benefit return ratio was not appropriate in this current economy. The cost of the certification was five percent of the construction costs. Part of the certification cost would go to LEED to review the building. However, before the review, the design team had to document all decisions made from the beginning of the project and consultants would need to be hired to provide the documentation. He expected that certification costs would drop over time.

**Project Manager Lavin** stated that the certification cost would be approximately 200,000 dollars.

**Commissioner Harrison** agreed with the other Commissioners about making environmentally conscious decisions concerning public buildings. He also agreed that it was not a good use of taxpayer dollars to have the building LEED certified. He asked if each of the seven dorm rooms slept one or two people. He recalled that emergency community supplies had been planned to be kept at each fire station. He asked if there would be room for those supplies to be stored in this facility.

**Engineer Fong** replied that firefighter operations called for one person per dorm room, but two could use it during an emergency situation. Private bedrooms with private bathrooms allowed for flexibility for staff gender. Additional storage capacity was planned for the three new stations and would be added during the retrofit of the existing stations.

**Commissioner King** asked for an explanation of the LEED designation and what would the city get for 220,000 dollars.

**Engineer Fong** replied that the LEED certification was similar to the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. The City of Fremont would be stating to others that new buildings within the city would be designed to meet the LEED requirements and some believed that it would be "ecologically the right thing to do for our grandchildren."

**Chairperson Weaver** asked if there was a time limit for LEED certification, say two or three years after the building was finished.

**Engineer Fong** stated that the current LEED process required that certification had to start during the beginning of the design process, because the choices made during the design and construction of the building had to be documented as the choices were made.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked if the Arts Commission had decided upon the public art and if one percent of the construction cost was still set aside for it. She asked how the architect was selected for this project.

**Associate Planner Meerjans** started that the process would begin in October and one percent of the cost would be for public art.

**Engineer Fong** stated that 26 responses were received and five were selected and interviewed. Experience in designing fire stations, good on-time schedule and delivery, cost containment control and familiarity with sustainable design were what staff had looked for.

**Commissioner Lydon** stated that he would be comfortable with the “Lavin-Fong” stamp of approval for this station, which would allow using the 220,000 dollars towards something else that was needed by the community.

**Chairperson Weaver** opened and closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Natarajan** comments were as follows:

- The concept of sustainable design for public buildings was a good idea, especially when other developers were being required to design green buildings. Meeting ten percent above Title 24 requirements should be strived for.
- The LEED certification was not needed, but the design should comply with it, if the rest of the Commission agreed.
- Sustainable building design and good design were not necessarily more expensive.
- This civic and public building should portray that image, even though it was within a residential community. The building form, roof shape and profile, colors, tinted glass and the notion of “being a residential building was the wrong approach.”
- The roof should be broken up and something other than the heavily tinted glass in the front should be used.
- The wainscoting should be changed and alternative materials considered, which should save money.
- Permeable paving should be explored.
- Landscaping should be more creative with more flowering vegetation and variety in scale.
- The public art should be integrated into the building’s design rather than being a separate art feature that would sit in front of the building.

She asked if Condition 1 under “During Construction” section should be listed under Landscaping?

**Associate Planner Meerjans** agreed that it should probably be under Landscaping.

**Commissioner Natarajan** continued:

- Condition A-10, tower element should be more than two to three feet to be effective.
- Condition B-3 should be more of a requirement rather than a “wish list.”

**Vice-Chairperson Wieckowski** suggested recommending to City Council that it adopt a Fremont green sustainable building standard that would be equal to or exceed the LEED standard and be at least ten percent in excess of Title 24 for energy efficiency.

A discussion ensued about Title 24 and the LEED standards.

It was agreed that the recommendation would be for a new City of Fremont standard for public buildings to equal or exceed the LEED standards, which would include this building.

**Commissioner King** made a motion for public buildings, only.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked that increasing the fence to eight feet with the top two feet covered by vegetation be added as a condition.

**Engineer Fong** asked if the Commission was recommending that this building be LEED certified or LEED certifiable.

It was agreed that it should be LEED certifiable.

**Chairperson Weaver** summarized the Commission's recommendations:

- LEED certifiable standard for public buildings
- Consider changing the glass tint on the front of the building
- Eight-foot wall with vegetation on the top two feet
- More creative landscape pallet
- Public art feature be included within the building design

**Commissioner King** stated that he did not see the role of a Commissioner was to redesign a project that was brought before the Commission.

Discussion followed concerning the role of the Planning Commission, which included land use decisions, along with site planning and architectural review. The substance of the motion was also discussed.

**Commissioner King** withdrew his motion.

**Commissioner Harrison** made the motion and included the above recommendations.

IT WAS MOVED (HARRISON/WIECKOWSKI) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (7-0-0-0-0) THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;

**AND**

**FIND THAT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 3, 2003 ADDRESSED AND MITIGATED THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THIS PLANNED DISTRICT AMENDMENT;**

**AND**

**FIND THAT PLN2004-00049 IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S FUNDAMENTAL GOALS AND HEALTH AND SAFETY CHAPTERS, AS SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT "B", HEREBY ADOPTED BY REFERENCE;**

**AND**

**FIND PLNPLN2004-00049, AS PER EXHIBIT "B" (SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND CIVIL, AND LANDSCAPE PLANS), FULFILLS THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE FREMONT MUNICIPAL CODE;**

**AND**

**RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE PLANNED DISTRICT AMENDMENT AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "A" (PLANNED DISTRICT AMENDMENT, EXHIBIT "B" (SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND CIVIL, AND LANDSCAPE PLANS), AND EXHIBIT "D" (MATERIAL COLOR AND SAMPLE BOARD) FOR PLN2004-00049 BE APPROVED, BASED UPON THE FINDINGS AND SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT "C".**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	7 – Harrison, King, Lydon, Natarajan, Sharma, Weaver, Wieckowski
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	0
RECUSE:	0



A member of the public requested that the following item be removed from consent.

**Chairperson Weaver** called for a recess at 8:05 p.m.

**Chairperson Weaver** reconvened the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

- Item 5. BART WARM SPRINGS EXTENSION (WSX) PARKLAND EXCHANGE - Central Park - (PLN2005-00065)** - to consider a finding of conformity with the General Plan for a proposed exchange of approximately 1.0 acres of land in Central Park to construct two vent and emergency evacuation structures in exchange for approximately 1.0 acres of land east of the existing Union Pacific Railroad tracks adjacent to Strivers Lagoon. The exchanged property would be added to the City's Central Park. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for the parkland exchange and related effects to Central Park and is being circulated for review.

#### **MODIFICATION TO STAFF REPORT**

##### **Environmental Analysis** (page 4)

A Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the BART Warm Springs Extension was certified by the BART Board of Directors in June of 2003. This document identified and provided mitigations for the impacts of the possible two vent and emergency evacuation structures. The mitigation measures referenced in this draft Negative Declaration, provided as an Informational, are from the WSX EIR and SEIR and were adopted by BART when the EIR and SEIR were certified. As existing commitments of BART, the implementation of those mitigation measures form part of the existing or background conditions, which this draft Negative Declaration for the parkland disposition and acquisition takes into account. It is important to note that those mitigation measures from the WSX EIR and SEIR cannot now be modified or expanded. However, the City can rely on these mitigation measures as support for the City's own conclusion that no impacts will occur from the parkland disposition and acquisition, and that no mitigation is necessary in this draft Negative Declaration.

Correction to Informational Note that Environmental Impact Assessment No. PLN2005-00065 is a Negative Declaration. The title "Mitigated Negative Declaration" was an error; the correct title is "Negative Declaration".

**Planning Director Schwob** read the modification and correction, above.

**Senior Planner Livermore** reminded the Commission that the BART EIR and Supplemental EIR had already been certified by BART and all of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures involved with the under grounding of BART through Central Park had been identified in those two documents. Before the Commission tonight was the General Plan conformity relating to the acquisition of one acre and the disposition of one acre.

**Vice-Chairperson Wieckowski** disclosed that he had spoken with Project Manager Abtahi and Senior Planner Livermore regarding the modifications noted above.

**Chairperson Weaver** opened the public hearing.

**Nancy Jewell Cross** stated that she had a question that needed to be answered before she could make her comments. She asked if a geographical map was available that showed the two railroad tracks in relation to the two parcels involved and Stivers Lagoon.

**Project Manager Abtahi** pointed out the railroad tracks and the two parcels adjacent to Stivers Lagoon on the map.

**Ms. Cross** stated that she was concerned about public transportation being available in a reasonable time and at a reasonable price between Union City and the San Jose area. She had spoken with travelers in Union City and at BART in Fremont. The people she spoke with did not support a BART extension to Warm Springs but were very enthusiastic about an extension of the Altamont Express that would connect at Union City and continue down to San Jose where it could connect with all of the train systems there. For the cost of BART's estimate of 750 million dollars for the extension to Warm Springs, the Altamont express could go all the way to San Jose, using existing tracks with a trolley between Mission Boulevard, through Union City BART and across the Dumbarton Bridge connecting with CalTrain on the other side of the bay in the Stanford Industrial Park. She showed site plans that illustrated her proposal. She talked about a trolley used at Stanford and an optically guided trolley that could be used along Decoto Road.

IT WAS MOVED (WIECKOWSKI/HARRISON) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (7-0-0-0-0) THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC MEETING;  
**AND**

**FIND THAT PLN2005-00065 IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S FUNDAMENTAL GOALS, TRANSPORTATION AND PARKS AND RECREATION CHAPTERS, AS SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT A, HEREBY ADOPTED BY REFERENCE.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	7 – Harrison, King, Lydon, Natarajan, Sharma, Weaver, Wieckowski
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	0
RECUSE:	0

## **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

Information from Commission and Staff:

- Information from staff: Staff will report on matters of interest.
- Information from Commission: Commission members may report on matters of interest.

**Commissioner King** asked when the March retreat was scheduled and asked if the Planning Commission was scheduled to meet December 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Planning Director Schwob** stated that the Monterey League Conference dates should be out soon. It was usually held during the third week in March. The December meeting had been changed from December 9<sup>th</sup> to December 2<sup>nd</sup> to accommodate the Mayor's farewell party also scheduled for December 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Commissioner Lydon** believed that the name of Warm Springs for the next BART station did not send an identifiable message to the rest of the Bay Area, and he asked that consideration be made concerning the inclusion of "Fremont" within the name of the station. He had asked several people at the Montgomery Street Station if they knew where Warm Springs was. No one knew where it was.

**Chairperson Weaver** agreed that he had a valid point. She suggested calling that station the South Fremont Station, as least as a start.

**Commissioner Natarajan** asked if photos had been taken of the old City Hall for the city's historic records, since it was in the process of being demolished.

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that Engineer Fong could have probably responded to her question, as that was one of his long-term projects. He believed that photos had been taken. He recalled two articles, one in The Argus, about the City Hall and another written by an architectural critic that he promised to make available to interested Commissioners.

**Commissioner Lydon** stated that Engineer Fong was at the old City Hall yesterday with a camera.

**Commissioner Natarajan** suggested that a retreat for the Planning Commission would be helpful in which the role of the Commission and what was expected of it could be discussed, among other topics.

**Planning Director Schwob** expected that a number of staffing vacancies would soon be filled and a retreat towards the end of the year would be a good vehicle in which to introduce staff and the Commissioners.

**Commissioner King** agreed that a retreat was in order and stated that he wanted to speak with Planning Director Schwob about a possible applicant.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

APPROVED BY:

Alice Malotte  
Recording Clerk

Jeff Schwob, Secretary  
Planning Commission